## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware corporation, and FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 04-1371 JJF

## POWER INTEGRATIONS' [PROPOSED] SPECIAL VERDICT AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

#### INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '876 PATENT

## Infringement of the '876 Patent

1. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally
infringed the following claims of the '876 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this
question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for
Fairchild.)
Claim 1:  YES  NO     Claim 17:  YES  NO     Claim 19:  YES  NO
2. If you answered "NO" as to any claim(s) in question 1, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild nevertheless infringes the claim(s) under the doctrine of equivalents? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)
Claim 1: YES NO Claim 17: YES NO

## Willful Infringement of the '876 Patent

YES

Claim 19:

3. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for any of questions 1-2, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of the claim(s) was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

NO

YES	NO	
	 1,0	

#### **INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '851 PATENT**

#### Infringement of the '851 Patent

4. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally infringed the following claims of the '851 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Claim 1:	YES		NO	
Claim 2:	YES		NO	A.
Claim 4:	YES		NO	
Claim 10:	YES	-	NO	V
Claim 11:	YES	×	NO	
Claim 13:	YES		NO	
Claim 16:	YES	A Company	NO	

5. If you answered "NO" as to any claim(s) in question 4, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild nevertheless infringes the claim(s) under the doctrine of equivalents? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Claim 1:	YES		NO	
Claim 2:	YES	50 <u>0</u>	NO	
Claim 4:	YES		NO	
Claim 10:	YES		NO	
Claim 11:	YES		NO	
Claim 13:	YES		NO	
Claim 16:	YES		NO	

### Willful Infringement of the '851 Patent

6. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for any of questions 4-5, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of the claim(s) was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES	NO
-----	----

## INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '366 PATENT

### Infringement of the '366 Patent

7. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally infringed the following claims of the '366 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild

Claim 1:	YES		NO	
Claim 2:	YES		NO	
Claim 9:	YES		NO	·
Claim 10:	YES		NO	
Claim 14:	YES	V-200-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00-00	NO	
Claim 16:	YES		NO	

8. If you answered "NO" as to any claim(s) in question 7, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild nevertheless infringes the claim(s) under the doctrine of equivalents? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Claim 1:	YES	( <u>1</u>	NO	
Claim 2:	YES		NO	
Claim 9:	YES		NO	
Claim 10:	YES		NO	
Claim 14:	YES		NO	
Claim 16:	YES		NO	

## Willful Infringement of the '366 Patent

9. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for any of questions 7-8, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of the claim(s) was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES		NO	
ILD	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	110	120000000000000000000000000000000000000

#### INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '075 PATENT

#### Infringement of the '075 Patent

10. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally infringed the following claims of the '075 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Claim 1:	YES		NO	
Claim 5:	YES	-	NO	

## Willful Infringement of the '075 Patent

11. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for question 10, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of the claim(s) was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES	-	NO	3
-----	---	----	---

Anticipation of	of the	<b>'876</b>	Patent	t
-----------------	--------	-------------	--------	---

12. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '876 Patent are anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Claim 1:	YES	 NO	
Claim 17:	YES	 NO	
Claim 19:	YES	 NO	

## Obviousness of the '876 Patent

13. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '876 Patent are obvious and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.) If you answer "YES" as to any claim, proceed to question 14.

Claim 1:	YES	NO	
Claim 17:	YES	 NO	
Claim 19:	YES	 NO	

14. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for question 13, indicate below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining the claim(s) are obvious.

## VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '851 PATENT

## Anticipation of the '851 Patent

15. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '851 Patent are anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Claim 1:	YES		NO	
Claim 2:	YES		NO	
Claim 4:	YES		NO	
Claim 10:	YES		NO	
Claim 11:	YES	**************************************	NO	
Claim 13:	YES		NO	
Claim 16:	YES	evillantessami i partico	NO	

#### Obviousness of the '851 Patent

16. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '851 Patent are obvious and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.) If you answer "YES" as to any claim, proceed to question 17 for that claim.

Claim 1:	YES		NO	
Claim 2:	YES		NO	
Claim 4:	YES		NO	-
Claim 10:	YES		NO	
Claim 11:	YES		NO	
Claim 13:	YES	22-0-0-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10	NO	-
Claim 16:	YES		NO	

. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for question 16, indicate below	which
ference(s) you have relied upon in determining the claim(s) are obvious.	

### VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '366 PATENT

## Anticipation of the '366 Patent

18. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '366 Patent are anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

Claim 1:	YES	 NO	
Claim 2:	YES	 NO	
Claim 9:	YES	NO	
Claim 10:	YES	NO	
Claim 14:	YES	 NO	
Claim 16:	YES	NO	

#### Obviousness of the '366 Patent

19. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '366 Patent are obvious and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.) If you answer "YES" as to any claim, proceed to question 20 for that claim.

Claim 1:	YES	 NO	
Claim 2:	YES	NO	
Claim 9:	YES	 NO	
Claim 10:	YES	NO	
Claim 14:	YES	 NO	
Claim 16:	YES	NO	

20. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for question 19, indicate below which
reference(s) you have relied upon in determining the claim(s) are obvious.

## VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '075 PATENT

## Anticipation of the '075 Patent

21. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '075 Patent are anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)
Claim 1:  YES  NO    Claim 5:  YES  NO
Obviousness of the '075 Patent
22. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '075 Patent are obvious and therefore invalid? (A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild.) If you answer "YES" as to any claim, proceed to question 23 for that
claim.
Claim 1:  YES  NO    Claim 5:  YES  NO
23. If you answered "YES" as to any claims for question 22, indicate below which
reference(s) you have relied upon in determining the claim(s) are obvious.

## DAMAGES DUE TO POWER INTEGRATIONS

# Damages for Infringement of the '876, '851,'366, and/or '075 Patents 24. If you have found that Fairchild has infringed at least one asserted claim from any of the '876, '851, '366, and/or '075 Patents, and you have found that the claim is not invalid and the patent is not unenforceable, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Power Integrations suffered actual damages as a result of Fairchild's infringement? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.) YES NO 25. If you answered "YES" to question 24, state the type and amount of damages you find Power Integrations to have proven by a preponderance of the evidence: Past Lost Profits from Lost Sales or Past Reasonable Royalty:\_\_\_\_\_ Past Lost Profits from Price Erosion: Future Lost Profits from Price Erosion:\_\_\_\_ TOTAL DAMAGES \_\_\_\_\_

You must each sign this Verdict Form:	Dated:
(foreperson)	